

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully traverses and requests reconsideration.

The restriction requirement alleges that there are two distinct inventions, namely Group I directed to claims 1-20, 23 and 24 and Group II, directed to claims 21 and 22. The reason for the restriction is that at least the method claim 21 can be practiced with a materially different product. However, the office action does not indicate what materially different product the restriction requirement is referring to, as such there does not appear to be a prima facie showing, accordingly the restriction requirement should be withdrawn. In any event, Applicant has amended claim 1, not as to patentability, but instead to indicate that the product being used in method claim 21 is one similar to that in claim 1 that includes a first and second inflatable compartments that are defined at least in part by at least one diagonal seal structure. Accordingly, it requires the same product noted in claim 1 and as such the restriction requirement should be withdrawn.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance and that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. The Examiner is invited to contact the below-listed attorney if the Examiner believes that a telephone conference will advance the prosecution of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: Jan. 18, 2005

By: Christopher J. Reckamp
Christopher J. Reckamp
Registration No. 34,414

Vedder, Price, Kaufman & Kammholz, P.C.
222 N. LaSalle Street
Chicago, Illinois 60601
Phone: (312) 609-7599
Fax: (312) 609-5005